



The European Union's "MED/2004/098-474" Project  
for the MED Region

Service Contract for a Monitoring System of the  
Implementation of Projects and  
Programmes of External Co-operation Financed by the  
European Community

Lot 5: Mediterranean (MED) Region

***Synthesis Report for the  
SMAP I and SMAP II  
Programmes***

**December 2005**



**This project is funded  
by the European Union**



**A project implemented by  
EPU-NTUA Consortium**  
ICCS-NTUA (EPU) - MWH - HSTPE -TMS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. PROGRAMME SYNOPSIS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAMME .....	1
2.2. PROGRAMME INTERVENTION LOGIC .....	1
2.3. PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAMME .....	2
<b>3. WORK PLAN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. APPROACH OF THE MED MONITORING TEAM TO THE MONITORING OF REGIONAL PROGRAMMES .	7
3.2. INCORPORATION OF THE SMAP PROGRAMMES IN THE WORKPLAN .....	8
3.3. PREPARATION OF MISSIONS .....	10
<b>4. INSIGHTS OF THE PROGRAMME .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1. PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE BY MONITORING CRITERIA .....	12
4.2. PROJECTS PERFORMANCE BY MONITORING CRITERIA AND PRIME ISSUES .....	13
4.3. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECTS OVER TIME .....	17
4.4. STRONG AND WEAK POINTS BY CRITERION IN 2005 .....	17
4.5. ANALYSIS PER COUNTRY .....	18
4.6. ANALYSIS PER TYPE OF PARTNER .....	20
<b>5. SPECIAL ISSUES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1. DECONCENTRATION .....	23
5.2. FOLLOW UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS .....	23
5.3. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH .....	24
<b>6. SUCCESS STORY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1. BACKGROUND .....	25
6.2. REASONS OF SUCCESS .....	25
<b>7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>27</b>
7.1. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS ON THE SMAP PROJECTS, AS IMPLEMENTED .....	27
7.2. LESSONS LEARNT .....	28
7.3. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	28

## ANNEXES

---

**ANNEX I: Monitoring Reports produced**

**ANNEX II: Average score per criterion per project across the years**

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Projects under the SMAP I and SMAP II Programmes .....	3
Table 2:	Modifications of the M-Portfolio regarding SMAP projects.....	8
Table 3:	Portfolio of projects and monitoring plan of SMAP projects in 2005.....	9
Table 4:	Monitored projects in 2005 .....	10
Table 5:	Overview of the monitoring activity for the SMAP Programmes .....	10
Table 6:	Average ratings per each main criterion (SMAP).....	12
Table 7:	Average ratings for main criteria and prime issues.....	13
Table 8:	Performance of projects over time .....	17
Table 9:	Strong and weak points per main criterion and sub-criterion.....	17
Table 10:	Situation of projects in the various MED countries.....	19
Table 11:	Type of Partners of SMAP Projects.....	20

# 1. INTRODUCTION

---

In its Technical Proposal, the MED Monitoring Contractor proposed to elaborate and submit to the EC Synthesis Reports on the main Regional Programmes that are subject to monitoring in 2005, presenting in brief the monitoring activity implemented with respect to these Programmes and its key-findings, and focusing in a synthetic way on the results of the monitoring. Experience from the past had shown that such synthetic reports were very welcome to the European Commission Task Managers.

In December 2005, when all Monitoring Visits to the projects of the SMAP I and SMAP II Programmes, had been implemented, the MED Monitoring Team proceeded to the elaboration of the present Synthesis Report on the SMAP Programme, in consultation with the Head of Unit AIDCO/A3 and with the Task Manager ROM in the AIDCO/A2 and with their approval.

## 2. PROGRAMME SYNOPSIS

---

### 2.1. Background of the Programme

The objective of sustainable development and its environmental dimension have been fully integrated in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership through the Barcelona Declaration of 1995. Participants at the Conference emphasised their interdependence with regard to environment, the need for a regional approach, increased co-operation, better co-ordination of existing multilateral programmes. They recognised the importance of reconciling economic development with environmental protection, of integrating environmental concerns into the relevant aspects of economic policy and of mitigating the negative environmental consequences which might result. They confirmed their attachment to the Barcelona Process and the Mediterranean Action Plan.

The Commission was entrusted in the Barcelona Declaration with the co-ordination of the preparation of a Short and Medium-term Priority Environmental Action Programme (SMAP). A participatory approach was foreseen with the involvement of all Partners in this preparation from the start, through meetings of Euro-Med Environmental Correspondents, designated for this purpose within the relevant Environment Ministries. Consultations have also taken place with the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP) Co-ordination Unit, with METAP, major NGOs with activity in the Region, and with other relevant civil society organisations.

In the above context, the SMAP was adopted in November 1997 at the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on the Environment held in Helsinki. The SMAP is a Programme coordinated by the EC for the protection of the Mediterranean environment. Its aim is to encourage all Mediterranean countries to adopt sustainable environmental strategies and policies and to improve the status of the environment in the region. EC contributions to SMAP are provided in 3 phases. The EC commitment for the first phase is of 6 mio EUR and for the second phase 30 mio EUR.

### 2.2. Programme Intervention Logic

#### Overall Objectives

- to help to change the current trend of environmental degradation in the region, which continues despite major efforts by all Partners at national and regional levels;
- to contribute to the sustainable development of the region, to the protection of Mediterranean environment and to the improvement of the health and the living conditions of the population;
- to contribute to the further integration of environmental concerns in all other policies;
- to strengthen the coherence and secure synergies with existing multilateral programmes and legal instruments, in particular with the Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), the Barcelona Convention and its related Protocols and with METAP and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) - while respecting the specificity of each forum;
- to encourage North / South, South / South and North / South / South co-operation;

- to contribute to creating new employment opportunities;
- to ensure that, with the building-up of a Free Trade area, steps are taken from the start to highlight trade and environment issues, and that the respective policies are mutually supportive, paying due respect to the environmental commitments.

#### Specific Objectives

- to become the common basis for environmental purposes (policy orientation and funding) in the Mediterranean region, responding to national / regional needs and ensuring public support through wider consultation processes including civil society; at the same time, to appear attractive to other donors, investors and international financial institutions;
- to ensure a greater visibility of activities as well as transparency within this framework;
- to ensure a real positive impact, at least in some areas, mainly through prevention policies but also through remedial and rehabilitation programmes as necessary;
- to offer a better chance of financing programmes as well as individual projects;
- to give an additional support to the concerns of Environment Ministries or other competent authorities of the region in the context of national programming for MEDA;
- to increase the chances of getting more credits for the environment in the region than is currently the case, including from International Financial Institutions.

#### Priority fields of action

On the basis of the above indications and also taking into account the existing data and knowledge of the problems and work in other fora (notably in the context of MAP and MCSD), the following five fields of action are suggested, with the understanding that duplication with other relevant international instruments should be avoided and that coherence should always be sought. Two of these fields cover major sectoral issues (water, waste), one covers specific issues of an urgent nature (hot spots) while the fourth and fifth ones offer the opportunity of addressing intersectoral problems in an integrated way in specific -often sensitive or even vulnerable- geographical areas (desertification, coastal management). The important objective of protecting the biodiversity, having an intersectoral character, is dealt with under at least three of the selected fields of action.

SMAP covers five priority areas:

- ✓ Integrated Water Management,
- ✓ Integrated Waste Management,
- ✓ Hot Spots (covering both polluted areas and threatened bio-diversity systems),
- ✓ Integrated Coastal Zone Management, and
- ✓ Combating Desertification.

Support measures encompassing training / capacity building, awareness campaigns, networking, environmental impact assessments are more specifically targeted.

### **2.3. Projects under the Programme**

A table recapitulating all the Projects of the Programme is presented overleaf:

**Table 1: Projects under the SMAP I and SMAP II Programmes**

N	CRIS	Project Title	Coordinator	End date	EC Budget (in euro)	Monitoring History	Partner countries	Short description	Mgmt
<b>SMAP Phase 1 (CRIS No: 3951)</b>									
1	54731	Combating desertification: Promoting Sustainable Use of Agriculture Land through Introduction of Organic Farming Methods ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-02	Egyptian Biodynamic Association - EBDA	30 Mar 2003	810.310	2002 (Egypt, Tunisia, Turkey) 2003 (Egypt)	Egypt Tunisia Turkey	Official policy in MED countries is supportive of activities that encourage sustainable agricultural practices without undermining farmers' income. Governments are concerned to alleviate problems associated with environmental degradation arising out of non-sustainable land use practices, both in order to increase food security and to provide benefits that will improve the quality of life of new farmers and rural population in the Mediterranean Basin.	AIDCO
2	54733	Mediterranean Urban Waste Management Programme ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-5	United Nations Development Programme	01 Aug 2003	693.969	2002 (Jordan, Egypt, Cyprus) 2003 (Egypt, Jordan)	Egypt Jordan Cyprus	The project contributed to the enhancement of local expertise in integrated aspects of municipal solid waste management through the transfer of technology, know-how and best practices among Mediterranean cities, the identification of cost recovery and public private partnerships in municipal solid waste management and the promotion of the public awareness and stakeholder participation at the local, national and regional levels. Guidelines for Municipal Waste Management have been developed and are available through the web site.	AIDCO
3	54732	Regional Community Solid Waste Management Programme ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-03	Arab Network for Environment and Development RAED	31 Dec 2003	749.565	2002 (Morocco, Egypt, Lebanon) 2003 (Egypt, Lebanon)	Egypt Tunisia Morocco Lebanon	Infrastructure and resources for waste collection and management are not always sufficient in some areas of southern Mediterranean countries. In the cases of unavailability of proper facilities for final disposal of solid waste, uncontrolled dumpsites are widespread. The project addresses the problem of overproduction and management of solid waste in 4 environmentally vulnerable areas in Egypt, Lebanon, and Tunisia & Morocco. Activities are focused on identification of new approaches of solid waste collection, implementation of new methods of waste recycling and reuse, relieving the negative impacts, raising awareness, educating the communities and promotion partnerships and cooperation on environmental issues between NGOs, governments and local authorities.	AIDCO
4	54735	Conservation and Management of Biodiversity Hotspots: Developing a Mediterranean Network ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-01	World Wide Fund for Nature - WWF European Policy Programme	31 Dec 2003	1.121.936	2002 (Morocco, Lebanon, Tunisia, Turkey) 2003 (Italy)	Morocco Tunisia Turkey Lebanon	The project, coordinated by the WWF European Policy Programme, contributed to integrate nature conservation and sustainable development in 4 biodiversity hotspots in the Mediterranean region. In Lebanon the project addressed the threats that the cedar woodlands face (grazing by goats, and forest fires). In Morocco the project worked together in the Essaouira province. There are 3 woodland types in this hotspot: the endemic Argan, Barbary woodlands and the junipers on the coastal sand dunes. In Turkey the project supported monk seal conservation at three sites along the Turkish coast – Foca, Karaburun and Cilician. In Tunisia the project protected African oak and cork oak.	AIDCO

N	CRIS	Project Title	Coordinator	End date	EC Budget (in euro)	Monitoring History	Partner countries	Short description	Mgmt
5	54734	Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-6	ECOPEACE - FoEME	22 Aug 2005	561.063	2002 (Palestine, Israel) 2003 (Jordan, Palestine) 2005 (Jordan)	Israel Jordan Palestinian National Authority	In Israel, Jordan and Palestine water is scarce resource. The cross boundary nature of the shared water resources could be a catalyst for conflict. For the same reasons, regional co-operation on water issues could be a possible way towards a lasting peace. The project is aiming to focus public awareness on the shared water problems of Israelis, Palestinians and Jordanians. The project also aims to encourage regional sustainable water management practices by focusing on conservation, efficiency and fair water allocation. An interesting project, doing valuable grass root work with only modest EC resources.	AIDCO
6	54736	Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia ME8/B7-4100/IB/99/0233-04	ENVIROTECH Ltd	03 Nov 2005	1.401.100	2002 (Lebanon, Syria) 2003 (Lebanon) 2005 (Syria, Lebanon)	Lebanon Syria Italy	The project aims at contributing towards integrated approaches for managing coastal areas in an environmentally, economically and socially sustainable way. The project also aims at designing and implementing an integrated system of coastal zone management between Jbeil/Amsheet in Lebanon and Latakia in Syria, at running a training programme for upgrading local staff skills and practices, and implement demonstration actions (ecotourism, waste water treatment plant, sanitary landfill).	AIDCO
<b>SMAP Phase 2 (CRIS No: 4855)</b>									
1	61786	Regional project for the development of marine and coastal protected areas in the Mediterranean Region ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-2	Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA), Tunis	31 Jan 2005	1.748.374	2003 (Morocco)	Morocco, Cyprus, France, Israel, Italy, Spain, Malta, Algeria, Syria, Tunisia	The project is aimed at assisting the Mediterranean countries to strengthen conservation and the sustainable management of the elements that make up the Mediterranean marine and coastal biological diversity. In each country having already marine protected areas, the project helped in developing a management plan of one marine protected area. In countries, which have not yet established marine protected areas on their Mediterranean coasts, the project helps identifying sites that contain habitats of interest with a view to develop marine protected areas. Underwater ecological assessment is part of the work.	AIDCO
2	61791	Rapport Environnement et Développement en Méditerranée ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-11	Plan Bleu, Centre d'Activité Régionale PNUE, Sophia – Antipolis, France	10 Oct 2005	500.000	Not Monitored	-	-	EC Del Cairo
3	61788	Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-4	Universidad Politécnica de Madrid - Instituto de Energia Solar , IES/UPM	20 Dec 2005	2.291.013	2003 (Spain) 2005 (Spain)	Morocco Algeria Tunisia Spain France	Around 50% of population in developing countries doesn't have access to clean drinking water and about 80% of all diseases in these countries are caused by a poor water provision. Furthermore in rural areas of these countries people often don't have electricity. In this context, water pumping and purification systems with PV power supply is a good decentralized solution, if they are correctly designed and adapted to the special conditions of this area and to the peculiarities of the inhabitants. The project is aiming to contribute to	EC Del Cairo

N	CRIS	Project Title	Coordinator	End date	EC Budget (in euro)	Monitoring History	Partner countries	Short description	Mgmt
								the improvement of the provision of safe drinking water in rural areas of three Mediterranean countries (Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia) with the implementation of a regional water pumping and purification programme with photovoltaic solar energy	
4	61789	M&E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-6	Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel (OSS)	31 Dec 2005	1.438.945	2003 (Tunisia) 2005 (Tunisia)	Morocco Tunisia	Combating desertification is very closely linked to integrated soil, plant cover and water management and its expansion is threatening not only the biodiversity, including natural habitats, but also the sustainability of the production of basic goods for human life. The main objective of the project is to support North African countries to establish follow up systems to monitor and evaluate the impact of the National and Regional Action Programmes to Combat Desertification. These Action Programmes are the national and regional policy tools for the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD).	EC Del Cairo
5	61787	Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-7	Institut Català d'Energia, ICAEN	31 Mar 2006	2.020.745	2003 (Spain) 2005 (Spain)	Lebanon Morocco Cyprus Spain	The project purpose is to improve urban air quality management through a technical assistance programme to build up managerial and technical capacity both at national and local levels. It aims also at informing the public on environmental risks and involving them in priority setting and in participation to decision making. The objectives for each urban area include: long term plans to reduce polluting emissions, urban mobility plans with diagnosis of the present situation, development of an institutional technical organism for the implementation of air quality policies and programmes, capacity building for policy makers, awareness raising for local stakeholders and establishment of networking practices and facilities in order to share experience and information and to disseminate project results.	EC Del Cairo
6	61792	Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU) ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP 10-APAT	Agenzia Nazionale Per la Protezione Ambiente (ANPA) APAT-SYKE	30 Jun 2006	3.124.000	2003 (Italy) 2005 (Italy)	All MEDA Countries	The overall objective of the project is to contribute to the wider objectives of the Barcelona Process for EU Mediterranean partnership and especially in its economic/financing chapter. The project aims to contribute to the maximization of the impact and multiplier effects of the funded projects for the beneficiary countries, both at national and regional level. The project seeks to achieve these goals through better programme management, networking amongst programme stakeholders, better information dissemination and clearer programme visibility and greater sustainability and impact.	AIDCO
7	61785	Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq & Maghreb countries ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-9	International Bank for Reconstruct and Development, IBRD THE WORLD BANK	31 Dec 2006	5.000.000	2003 (Tunisia) 2005 (Tunisia)	Algeria Egypt Jordan Morocco Syria Tunisia Palestinian National Authority	The overall objective of the project is to promote the adoption of sustainable integrated waste management practices in Mediterranean Environment Technical assistance Programme (METAP) beneficiary countries. The project aims to assist target countries in: designing, developing and implementing the main elements of ISWM systems, promoting the exchange of information and experience in the region and laying the groundwork and building the necessary foundation for increased investment in the sector. The project seeks to achieve these goals through capacity development	EC Del Cairo



N	CRIS	Project Title	Coordinator	End date	EC Budget (in euro)	Monitoring History	Partner countries	Short description	Mgmt
							Lebanon	supported by provision of the tools necessary to enable national and sub-national entities to apply ISWM, identification of regional options and strategies for implementing ISWM and creation of a regional network of experience including a center of expertise based in Tunisia and clusters of expertise in each partner country.	
8	61790	Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agropastoral Communities in North Africa ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP-5	Nucleo di Ricerca sulla Desertificazione, Università di Sassari, Sardinia, Italy	01 Apr 2007	3.446.678	2003 (Italy) 2005 (Italy)	Tunisia Morocco Italy	Local communities have a greater stake than anyone else in managing and improving their agricultural production system while ensuring the long-term ecological balance of their fragile lands. Effective changes requires co-operative actions between all parties, government, agricultural researchers, community based groups and inhabitants. The overall objective of the project is to contribute, through a participatory approach to the development and dissemination across the Mediterranean of mitigation actions and techniques for the improvement of marginal agro pastoral systems and for contributing to the fight against desertification through restoration of degraded rangelands.	EC Del Cairo
9	61794	The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project Subvention- ME8/AIDCO/2001/013 2/SMAP 3	Environmental Quality Authority - EQA- of the Palestinian Authority	30 Sep 2007	3.881.730	2003 (Palestine)	Palestinian National Authority Jordan	The project focuses on two areas opposite of the Jordan river: the Wadi Al Fara'a in the Nablus district on the West Bank and the Wadi Zerqa Jerash area on the East Bank escarpment in Jordan. These areas are geographically bounded to the same region. Both local populations as well as the environmental problems they face have similar characteristics. The overall objective of the project is to create sustainable development conditions for the rural population in the project area. The project aims directly to address the watershed related problems in an integrated and effective manner. Experiences are gathered and exchanged from both project areas. The project objectives are fully consistent with the target countries Environmental Action Plan. Pilot interventions will be implemented in these two areas and a medium term integrated management plan will be developed for both.	EC Del Cairo
10	75816	Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan	UNDP Lebanon	29 Feb 2008	1.738.411	2005 (Jordan, Syria)	Lebanon Syria Jordan	Lebanon, Syria and Jordan rely heavily on olive and olive oil production for local consumption as well as for export. Olive oil production in these countries is a polluting industry, which contributes to the degradation of water quality and agricultural lands. The governments of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan jointly decided to put an end to the degradation of their resources without harming the production and growth of this important agro-industrial sector. This project aims at introducing an integrated waste management system to the olive oil industry by building relevant expertise, setting standards and introducing cleaner production options, prevention measures and control and treatment options along with a defined monitoring strategy for olive oil production.	EC Del Cairo

## 3. WORK PLAN

---

### 3.1. Approach of the MED Monitoring Team to the monitoring of Regional Programmes

The portfolio of EC-funded Projects in the wider Mediterranean Region consists of various types of projects, depending mainly on the design of the projects, the geographical area addressed by them, their size and complexity and the EC Services assigned with the responsibility for their direct management. There are three main types of projects, to which all MED projects can be grouped: (a) National (bilateral), (b) Regional, (c) NGO.

The analysis of each of these types of projects reveals a large diversity in terms of the projects' specific characteristics, which may be grouped accordingly.

The Regional Projects are projects addressing a group of countries through complete interventions. In many cases they are grouped under thematic/sectoral Programmes. The responsibility for their implementation is usually with the Project Coordinator, i.e. the leader of the implementing consortium, while the EC Headquarters (AIDCO) has been, until recently, the EC Service responsible for their management. In 2005 the deconcentration of the Regional Programmes began. The SMAP is one example of deconcentrated Programmes, the management of which has been assigned to the EC Delegation in Egypt in November 2005.

The MED Monitoring Team, based on its experience gained in the previous period of MED Monitoring implementation (2002-2004), has applied a classification of Regional Programmes and Projects in the following three main categories:

- Projects with strong components in the MED countries and/or projects addressing a small number of MED countries like "The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project".
- Projects the main bulk of activity of which is implemented in one country (Europe or MED) by their coordinators / EU partners, while there are some activities in the MED, like the "Regional project for the development of marine and coastal protected areas in the Mediterranean Region".
- Projects implemented in Europe to produce results concerning the MED Region (category that could apply for a project acting as a Regional Management and Support Unit (RMSU) for the whole Euromed Water, similarly to other Regional Programmes), like the SMAP RMSU Project.

The MED Monitoring Team, in consultation with and with the approval of the AIDCO/A2 and AIDCO/A3, applies customised monitoring approaches for the categories of regional programmes and projects as follows:

- Projects with strong components in the MED countries and/or projects addressing a small number of MED countries: These projects are monitored in the MED country where the big bulk of activity is implemented and/or the Project Coordinator is based.
- Projects the main bulk of activity of which is implemented in Europe by their coordinators / EU partners, while there are some activities in the MED: The Projects' Coordinators are visited first and, depending on the findings of these visits and on the needs of the Task Managers, a plan of sample visits to high priority partners and countries is set, which helps among other to identify best practices and problem issues. The number and locations (countries) of the sample visits is subject to the limits of the M-Project's budget.
- Projects implemented in Europe to produce results concerning the MED Region: The monitoring approach to these projects provides for visits to the Projects' Coordinators in Europe.

Each programme is assigned to a "pair" of Leading Monitors, equally responsible and equally informed, so as to enable the M-Team to implement efficiently and effectively, early in the project-year, the first visits to the Coordinators within a logical time frame and to respond to the needs for sample visits to some of the projects in the MED countries in the frame of the respective country visits. Furthermore, these two Leading Monitors are selected so as to be fully complementary in terms of sector / management-monitoring expertise and experience, as well as in terms of language skills. The two Leading Monitors of each Regional Programme lead the monitoring of all the projects of this Programme, while other EU Monitors, with the required sector and/or management-monitoring expertise, participate in the monitoring of the projects as Monitors as and when required. The Regional Support Network Experts and the National Monitors complement these teams of regional projects' monitoring in the case of the regional Missions in the MED. Finally, the Leading Monitors of

the Regional Programmes are responsible for the elaboration of the Synthesis Reports on their Programmes.

### 3.2. Incorporation of the SMAP Programmes in the Workplan

The definition of the M-Portfolio started with the reception of the list of projects to be monitored in 2005, prepared by AIDCO/A2 in coordination with the EC Delegations in MED Countries and with AIDCO/A3 for (non de-concentrated) regional programmes. The portfolio was checked by the MED M-Team so as to ensure the monitorability of the projects versus the three main monitorability criteria. Based on this, the M-Team prepared a proposed Workplan for 2005, which was adjusted and consolidated through continuous coordination and consultation with the concerned AIDCO Units (A2 and A3 and with the EC Delegations).

In the frame of this process, the M-Portfolio regarding SMAP projects has remained within its initial scope, with, however, some minor modifications of the plan of Project-Visits. All these modifications that occurred to date in the frame of the M-Team's cooperation with AIDCO and the EC Delegations have been approved by AIDCO/A2, on the basis of the following main inputs:

**Table 2: Modifications of the M-Portfolio regarding SMAP projects**

Need or reason for adjustments	Initiator	Result
Elimination from the M-Portfolio (not meeting the monitorability criteria)	AIDCO/A3	Elimination of the following SMAP Project: - Technical assistance to SMAP III
Second visits required	AIDCO/A3	The need has occurred through the consultation of the M-Team with the AIDCO/A3, for second visits in MED countries to the following SMAP projects: - Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia - Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan - The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project

This process resulted in the following projects to be monitored in 2005:

#### SMAP Phase 1:

- Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness
- Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia

#### SMAP Phase 2:

- Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries
- M&E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries
- Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality
- Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)
- Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq & Maghreb countries
- Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agropastoral Communities in North Africa
- The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project
- Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan

The above process resulted in the following plan for the monitoring of SMAP projects in 2005:

**Table 3: Portfolio of projects and monitoring plan of SMAP projects in 2005**

[illegible]

The main data of the Monitoring Missions in the frame of which SMAP projects have been monitored in 2005 are presented in the following two Tables:

**Table 4: Monitored projects in 2005**

N°	Mission	Period	Projects monitored	Monitoring Reports produced
1	Jordan-Yemen	10 – 22 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness</li> <li>- Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan</li> </ul>	2
2	Syria	12 – 21 September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia</li> <li>- Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan</li> </ul>	2
3	Tunisia	26 September – 07 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries</li> <li>- Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq &amp; Maghreb countries</li> </ul>	2
4	Lebanon	12 – 28 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia</li> </ul>	1
5	Regional Mission 3	12 – 28 October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries</li> <li>- Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality</li> <li>- Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)</li> <li>- Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agro pastoral Communities in North Africa</li> </ul>	4
6	Palestine-Israel	06 – 19 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project</li> </ul>	1

**Table 5: Overview of the monitoring activity for the SMAP Programmes**

Statistics of the Monitoring Activity from 24/03/05 to 31/12/05			
N° of projects monitored	10	N° of monitoring operations	13
N° of specified sectors covered (at the level of CRS code)	1	N° of monitoring reports	12
N° of missions undertaken	6	Million € covered (All projects monitored)	24,90
N° of Countries visited	7	Average size of Project monitored (mio €)	2,49

### 3.3. Preparation of Missions

#### 3.3.1. Cooperation with AIDCO

As mentioned in Section 3.2 above, the Work plan for 2005 was adjusted and consolidated through a continuous coordination and consultation with the AIDCO/A2, responsible for the MED Monitoring Project and the AIDCO/A3, responsible for Regional Programmes and Projects:

1. On the level of AIDCO/A2, regular meetings were held to update the Work plan and to prepare the Monitoring Missions. This also included briefing and debriefing with AIDCO/A2 geographical coordinators for the country missions.
2. On the level of AIDCO/A3, working contacts and consultation concerned fine tuning of the "Regional Projects" component of the Work plan and preparation and organisation of all planned monitoring missions, as well as the briefing meetings related to them. Several debriefing meetings were also held, following the implementation of M-Visits to projects from SMAP

Programmes.

### **3.3.2. Cooperation with the EC Delegations**

At the beginning of the M-Contract, an Introductory Note was sent by AIDCO/A to all the concerned Heads of Delegations in MED Countries, presenting to them the Consortium in charge of MED Monitoring and the portfolio of projects for 2005. At the level of the MED Countries, and following the Introductory Note sent by AIDCO, the M-Project established its first working contact with all the concerned EC Delegations on 13 April 2005, proposing dates and tentative contents for the monitoring missions in their respective countries. These contacts refer mainly to the monitoring of National projects and Regional projects with strong components in the MED countries and/or projects addressing a small number of MED countries, but it also refers to the Regional projects – parts of Programmes, which are to be visited (second visit) in some of the MED countries.

Given that the management of the SMAP II Programme was deconcentrated to the EC Delegation in Egypt in the course of 2005, the MED Monitoring Team worked closely with the AIDCO/A3 during most of the year 2005, and established in autumn 2005 specific contacts with the EC Delegation in Egypt. The cooperation has been efficient and all proposed missions (to the SMAP project coordinators and to the components of some projects in some other MED countries) have been approved in terms of content and dates. Following the request of the AIDCO, direct contacts and consultation of the MED Monitoring Team with the projects' coordinators (and their partners) for all projects were developed, in order to concretely prepare all the technical and logistical aspects of the missions.

### **3.3.3. Preparation and organisation of the Monitoring Visits**

As already mentioned in the previous sections, the timing of the monitoring missions had been set at an early stage, in cooperation with the AIDCO and the EC Delegations. The Monitoring Team expanded the existing documentation already available from the previous ROM implementation period (2002-2004, previous M-Contract), with documentation received in close cooperation with AIDCO and the projects' Coordinators and partners.

Before the collection of the documentation on the projects to be monitored, all projects had been assigned to the Monitors. It is worth noting that the M-Team assigned the monitoring of the projects, which are re-monitored in 2005, to the same Monitors who had monitored them in 2003 (in 2004 the SMAP Programmes were not included in the Monitoring Portfolio of the MED Monitoring Team), and/or the previous years. Upon collection of the documentation from the respective actors, this documentation was sent to the experts, early in advance of the planned M-Visits' dates. No particular problems arose during this procedure.

Briefing and debriefing meetings with the AIDCO/A3 were organised, as appropriate (see 3.3.2 above). Furthermore, debriefing meetings took place in the EC Delegations of the countries where second visits were implemented to SMAP projects. Finally, one of the Leading Monitors of the SMAP Programme debriefed, in November 2005, the EC Task Manager in the Egypt Delegation on the findings of the monitoring of all SMAP projects monitored in 2005.

## 4. INSIGHTS OF THE PROGRAMME

### 4.1. Programme performance by monitoring criteria

The following table presents the average performance of the SMAP projects, which have been monitored in 2005. The performance of the projects is calculated as the average of the five monitoring criteria (Quality of project design, Efficiency of implementation to date, Effectiveness to date, Impact prospects, Potential sustainability). For the calculation of the average the grades a, b, c, d have been replaced by scores 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively.

**Table 6: Average ratings per each main criterion (SMAP)**

Criterion	Average rating	Sample (Number of Projects)	Sample (Number of M- Reports)
Quality of project design	2.98	10	12
Efficiency	2.88	10	12
Effectiveness	2.94	10	12
Impact	3.00	10	12
Sustainability	3.17	10	12
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>

NOTE: The Average of all reports produced for each project was calculated first and then the Average at Programme level (i.e. of all projects) was calculated.

As presented in the above table, the SMAP Programme is performing well (average performance at programme level is 2,99/4,00). In end-2005, the following projects (monitored in 2005) are considered as successes (projects with ratings “a” and/or “b” for all criteria):

- SMAP II: Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq & Maghreb countries
- SMAP 2000: Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness
- SMAP II: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification programme in the MED countries
- SMAP II: Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)
- SMAP II: The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project
- SMAP 2000: Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan (the mobilization phase just finished)
- SMAP II: Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agropastoral Communities in North Africa

Meanwhile the following project is considered as the least successful one, currently being at a critical stage (two or more “d” ratings):

- SMAP II: Integrated Coastal Management between the Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia

## 4.2. Projects performance by monitoring criteria and prime issues

Table 7: Average ratings for main criteria and prime issues

Code	Criterion	Projects										ALL
		SMAP I: Water Community Programme to Promote community based awareness	SMAP I: Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	SMAP I: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet &Latakia	SMAP II: M&E of action programme for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries	SMAP II: Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreb & Maghreb countries	SMAP II: Urban air quality improvement through air quality and mobility plans	SMAP II: Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)	SMAP II: Demonstration project on strategies to combat desertification in arid lands with direct involvement of local agropastoral communities in North Africa	SMAP II: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries	SMAP II: The Fara'a & Jerash Integrated watershed Management Project	
<b>M1</b>	<b>Quality of project design</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>1,50</b>	<b>3,30</b>	<b>4,00</b>	<b>2,00</b>	<b>4,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>2,98</b>
M11	Actual Relevance	3,00	3,00	1,50	4,00	4,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,05
M12	Feasibility & flexibility	3,00	3,00	1,50	3,00	4,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,95
<b>M2</b>	<b>Efficiency to date</b>	<b>3,40</b>	<b>3,40</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>2,40</b>	<b>3,20</b>	<b>2,20</b>	<b>3,80</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,60</b>	<b>2,80</b>	<b>2,88</b>
M21	Input availability	4,00	4,00	1,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,30
M22	Activity timeliness	3,00	3,00	1,00	2,00	3,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	2,60
M23	Results achievement	3,00	3,00	1,00	2,00	3,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	2,80
M24	Partner contribution & involvement	4,00	4,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,90
<b>M3</b>	<b>Effectiveness to date</b>	<b>3,10</b>	<b>3,10</b>	<b>1,60</b>	<b>2,80</b>	<b>3,60</b>	<b>2,60</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,60</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>2,94</b>
M31	Accessibility of results	3,00	3,00	1,50	4,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,15
M32	Use of results	3,00	3,00	1,50	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	2,95
M33	Project Purpose achievement	3,00	3,00	1,50	2,00	4,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,75
M34	Status of previous key observations	4,00	4,00	2,50	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,25
<b>M4</b>	<b>Impact Prospects</b>	<b>3,55</b>	<b>3,37</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>3,50</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,55</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,00</b>
M41	Ensuring of impact achievement	3,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	2,90
M42	Wider planned effects	4,00	2,67	0,50	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,92
M43	Status of previous key observations	4,00	2,67	0,50			3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00		2,02
<b>M5</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>3,11</b>	<b>3,11</b>	<b>1,70</b>	<b>3,63</b>	<b>3,75</b>	<b>3,44</b>	<b>3,11</b>	<b>3,30</b>	<b>3,50</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>3,17</b>
M51	Economic viability	3,00	3,00	1,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,10
M52	Local ownership	3,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,90
M53	Policy support	3,00	3,00	1,50	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,95
M54	Institution building	3,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00
M55	Socio-cultural adequacy	3,00	3,00	1,00	3,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,10
M56	Gender equality			1,00					3,00	3,00	3,00	1,00
M57	Technology appropriateness	3,00	3,00	1,50	4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	4,00	4,00	3,00	3,35
M58	Consideration for environ. protection	4,00	4,00	2,50			4,00	4,00	4,00	3,00		2,55
<b>TOTAL AVERAGE</b>		<b>3,23</b>	<b>3,20</b>	<b>1,36</b>	<b>3,13</b>	<b>3,51</b>	<b>2,65</b>	<b>3,38</b>	<b>3,06</b>	<b>3,45</b>	<b>2,96</b>	<b>2,99</b>



From the five monitoring criteria, "Efficiency to date" can be considered as the weaker point (but still with good performance of the programme), and "Potential Sustainability" is the strongest point of the SMAP Programme.

In terms of quality of project design, the overall conceptual design of six out of the ten monitored projects is concise, well structured and well presented, and is illustrated in a fairly well developed Logical Framework Matrix (LFM). Design weaknesses were revealed during the implementation of the remaining four projects. The project "Demonstration project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands" experienced two amendments and its original project design was slightly readjusted. Assumptions and risks had not been clearly defined in the project "M&E of action programme for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries". The design of the project "Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia" had been ambiguous and ambitious and has never really addressed either environmental protection needs or urban waste management. The project purpose of the project "Urban air quality improvement through air quality and mobility plans", to improve the air quality by March 2006, is too ambitious, while the correlation between objectives, project purpose and activities is unclear and there are no assumptions presented in the intervention logic.

At the level of Efficiency and Effectiveness, it is worth noting that all the projects with the exception of the project "Integrated management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan" have received extensions of their duration, in order to cope with the delays that occurred in their implementation. These delays are mainly related to the poor performance of the projects with regards to the involved procurement of equipment, preparation of tender documents and detailed designs for pilot projects (e.g. "Fara'a & Jerash" and "Integrated coastal management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia") and non-compliance of project reporting with the EC guidelines (despite the fact that most projects are now in the final phase of their implementation).

Furthermore, lack of strong management by the Project Coordinator has had significant impact quite early in the implementation phase of the projects. A typical example is the project "Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia", where the coordinator did not allocate sufficient staff, time and resources for proper implementation, has failed to engage the institutions with which the project was supposed to work as partners and has failed to deliver any significant long-term benefits; as a result, the project has not managed to deliver the outputs foreseen in its original design.

In general, impact prospects of SMAP projects are promising, with only one case ("Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia") achieving a very low visible impact due to reasons presented above. In most of the cases, beneficiaries/stakeholders are well aware of the projects' overall objectives, purposes and expected results and are keen on participating and contributing to the promotion and sustainability of results. However, further efforts of the Coordinators are needed so that the projects' results can reach the local level, since the local authorities and communities as well as other involved parties have high expectations from the projects.

Sustainability is the strongest criterion for the SMAP Programme. In most of the cases, National Authorities have expressed their willingness to actively support projects' results. Allocating national funds and adapting relevant policies and legislation could further promote project results.

A short analysis of the situation for each project follows hereafter:

#### **Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agro pastoral Communities in North Africa**

The project is the only SMAP project in the actual battle against land degradation. It was awarded a 19-month extension and has slightly readjusted its design, since plantation is suffering delays due to unusual weather conditions, behaviour of the participating communities and failure of contractors engaged in planting (in Morocco, about 20% of plantation has been achieved comparing to a 70% achievement in Tunisia). Nevertheless, the project is well established and has engaged practically all the originally foreseen parties. Moreover, it has gained the respect and commitment of the local agro-pastoral communities. National and international funds are available for the implementation of the current project methodology. Farmers/breeders, either independent or in cooperatives, are supporting the project. It is however worth noting that so far there is no phase out strategy prepared by the project.

#### **Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries**

At the time of the monitoring visit (October 2005), the project was running the last month of its contractual life. It had been awarded a 14-month extension in order to overcome significant delays caused by the tendering process for the equipment procurement. Adjustments to the project design were necessitated during the project implementation, to accommodate a drop in market prices of PV pumps and a change of the selected region in Algeria. The usage of an innovative and state-of-the-art technology in such remote areas proved to be a very robust and productive solution, easily accepted and integrated by the local beneficiaries. Most installations are in place and operating. Maintenance plans, developed with the participation of the benefiting communities, are under discussion with the local partners. Selection of wells, planning of tube locations and installation sites were all discussed and decided with the local communities. Technical specifications, expertise as well as operation and maintenance guidelines have been provided to the selected bodies, which will be responsible to operate the new systems. However, there is no overall phase-out strategy to reinforce sustainability.

#### **Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia**

This is a project designed to respond to a well-identified need. It is a case of failure in both countries, Lebanon and Syria. The lessons learnt are clear: proper management oversight of the project is indispensable to ensure successful implementation and delivery of the planned outputs and deliverables; engaging early in the project's life, the project partners is equally crucial for the implementation of such projects which are focused on the involved countries at local level. Even considering the political situation between the two countries, all parties/stakeholders involved in this project – the contractor, the central and local government authorities in both countries and the EC - have failed to be involved in (and responsible for) the professional delivery of the project's outputs. The design of future projects could be tailored, with the participation of the end-beneficiaries to meet real and agreed needs, and with the management being in the field. A full and detailed project evaluation could further specify useful experience gained through the project's implementation.

#### **Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan**

Letters of support from the Ministries of Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and the Regional Activity Center for Cleaner Production Mediterranean Action Plan Barcelona had been signed in 2000 but, due to the prevailing political situation in the region, the project actually started on 01-03-2005. The project is based on a cooperative strategy at institutional and technical levels. Its aim is to create partnerships among the 3 Ministries of Environment and other institutions, research centers, farmers' cooperatives and industrial and trade organisations. The project is reaching its cruising speed and implementation to date has not faced serious problems. However, the monitors have drawn the attention of the EC Managers on the risks, identified during the monitoring mission in Palestine, of potential duplication of activities with regards to the pilot actions of the project and of other SMAP projects, and recommended that the EC Delegation in Egypt clarify this issue with the management teams of the concerned SMAP projects, in order to secure complementarity and avoid any overlapping.

#### **Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)**

This well designed and useful project is coming close to end. The project differs significantly from all other SMAP projects, not only in terms of scope and objectives, but also for the multiplicity of its recipients. The project's services are offered to all other SMAP projects, to the SMAP Correspondents, to the EC Task Managers of SMAP I and SMAP II, to NGOs as well as to the Directorate General for Environment of the European Commission. Effective support is provided by the RMSU to the other SMAP projects in order to improve their reporting, reduce / avoid problems with procurement and improve their familiarisation with the EC procedures. The project website is another remarkable achievement, both in terms of quality and quantity.

#### **M&E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries**

So far, the development and validation of a series of the impact indicators is the most important outcome for the two involved countries. The system was tested in Tunisia (Tataouine) and the results were presented in July 2005. The project stakeholders requested for an extension of the project duration beyond December 2005, in order to ensure proper induction of the M&E system. The project duration was extended by 7 months until 31-12-2005, but the achievement of the expected results until the end of 2005 seems rather impossible, and the same is valid for the embedding and decentralisation of the developed expertise to the target organisations. The project authority being an international non-profit organisation, no problems are expected with regards to the financial and economic viability of the project results, but the Country Authorities in Tunisia and Morocco should develop a proper counterpart structure to take over the system after project completion.

### **Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq & Maghreb countries**

The project was awarded a 22-month extension without additional budget, to make up for delays occurred in the first phases of its implementation. Excellent means of communication have been developed (website, newsletters), which ensure full visibility of the EU on the project's outputs. The project Coordinator established good relations with the high level Authorities in the 8 partner countries. According to the Mid-term review dated December 2004, in five of the countries (Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Tunisia and Morocco) efficiency ranges from good to problematic, while performance indicators vary from good to very good in the other four. This finding was confirmed by the monitoring visit of October 2005, where the "efficiency to date" was scored as good. The project is contributing well to institutional and management capacity building. The promotion of the adoption of sustainable integrated waste management practices in METAP countries is inherently connected with continuous efforts over a longer period and the political environment and the conflicts in the broader area may affect the project's progress; however, the project's impact will be increasing in the long run. An evaluation of the project's results to date in the 8 partner countries, especially of the legal and institutional developments and the development of a strategy and national plans, is urgently needed to overcome the existing barriers and enhance the project's impact during its life.

### **The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project**

Basic measures taken to improve the project's performance included a request for contract amendment extending the project's duration to account for the delay occurred in the initiation of the project activities, coupled to a budget reallocation. The project duration was extended until 30 September 2007. Nine pilot projects for the Fara'a (Palestine) area and another 4 pilot projects for the Jerash (Jordan) have been selected to be implemented; all these pilot interventions were initiated by the targeted local communities. Activities in Jerash area are 14 months behind due to weak communication and coordination between the Palestinian and Jordanian sides. At present, the project is in its fourth phase, which consists of the preparation, implementation and monitoring of pilot projects in both areas. It is very optimistic to forecast that the pilot projects (especially the construction projects) and the remaining activities will be completed within the remaining period. The financial arrangement remains a problematic issue, since, apart from the advanced payment, no other interim payments have been released so far. Furthermore, there seem to be cases of duplication with interventions of other SMAP projects (see above SMAP project "Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan").

### **Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality**

Although the project duration was extended by one year (as proposed in the Monitoring Report of 2003) the project still suffers from confusion between objectives, results and activities. Several delays at project start phase resulted in the project implementation being primarily activity-oriented, losing the focus on project results and thus on project purpose. In spite of these problems, the project has managed to develop partnership synergies and to improve its effectiveness. Impact remains good, with reinforced participation of local authorities and achievements in awareness building. Reporting is weak, with only 3 reports produced in 4 years and their content not fully compliant with the General Conditions of the contract. The project purpose, to improve the air quality by March 2006, is very ambitious, thus an appropriate adjustment towards realistic levels is needed. Furthermore, additional funds and support by the local authorities are needed in order to sustain project results. The development of an institutional strengthening and a capacity building programme for the involved cities is appropriate for a sustainable handover of the project.

### **Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness**

A good project implemented by an experienced Co-ordinator and completed in August 2005. The project has in effect achieved its purpose. Despite the political situation prevailing in the area, communication channels were established with other communities in the neighbouring countries of Israel and Palestine and a region wide campaign was developed, on wise use of water and equitable share of water resources. These relationships will act as catalyst for the cross border cooperation on water issues in future. The project has succeeded to attract the interest of other international as well national donors and sponsors and it is known as the Good Water Neighbours project.

### 4.3. Performance of projects over time

As mentioned in previous sections, 10 projects of SMAP I & SMAP II Programmes have been monitored in 2005 through 6 monitoring missions. The average performance at Programme level, as it results from the findings of the monitoring visits, is presented in the Table below, together with the respective average performance identified in 2002 and 2003 by the Monitoring Team. It is noted that the SMAP Programme had not been included in the 2004 Monitoring Portfolio.

**Table 8: Performance of projects over time**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>All years</b>
Number of Projects	6	14	-	10	10
Number of Monitoring Reports	17	17	-	12	46
Quality of project design	3,21	2,96	-	2,98	3,05
Efficiency to date	3,12	2,74	-	2,88	2,91
Effectiveness to date	3,39	3,01	-	2,94	3,11
Impact Prospects	3,41	2,94	-	3,00	3,12
Sustainability	3,35	3,00	-	3,17	3,17
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>3,30</b>	<b>2,93</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,99</b>	<b>3,07</b>

Overall, the Programme maintains a rather steady, good performance over time. The Table above indicates an apparent better performance of the projects of the first phase of the Programme. It is however important to note that the SMAP projects included in the Monitoring portfolios of 2002, 2003 and 2005 are different, since a number of projects of the SMAP Phase I, which were monitored in 2002, had been completed in 2003 and thus replaced in the Monitoring Portfolio by new projects, mainly of the SMAP Phase II.

### 4.4. Strong and weak points by criterion in 2005

The strengths and the relative weaknesses of the monitored projects are presented in Table 10 below:

**Table 9: Strong and weak points per main criterion and sub-criterion**

Strong & Weak		P1:Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness	P2:Integrated waste management for theolive oil industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	P3:Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	P4:Integrated Coastal Management between Jbel/Amsheet and Latakia	P5: M&E of action programme for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries	P6:Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreg & Maghreb countries	P7:Integrated Coastal Management between Jbel/Amsheet and Latakia	P8:Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans	P9:Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMS)	P10: Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct involvement of local agropastoral communities in North Africa	P11: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification programme in the MED countries	P12: The Fara'a & Jerash Integrated Water Management Project	TOTAL
Project-visits		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
Strongest	Main Criterion	M4	M4	M2	M1	M5	M1	M3 M5	M5	M1	M5	M2 M3	M1 M5	M5
	Sub-criterion	M41 M42	M42 M43	M21 M24	M11 M12	M51 M53 M57	M11 M12	M31 M32 M33 M57 M58	M54 M55 M57 M58	M11 M12	M 55 M57 M 58	M21 M23 M31 M32 M34	M11 M12 M51 M52 M53 M54 M55 M56 M57	M11 M12 M57
Weakest	Main Criterion	M1	M1	M1	M2 M4	M2	M4	M1 M2 M4	M1 M2	M3 M4	M2	M1	M2	M1 M2
	Sub-criterion				M21 M22 M23 M24 M41	M22 M23	M41 M42	M11 M12 M21 M22 M23 M24 M41 M42 M43	M11 M12 M22 M23 M24				M22	M11 M12 M21 M22 M23

## 4.5. Analysis per country

This section provides a country-specific outlook of the situation regarding the implementation of the SMAP Programme in the region. It also presents, at the extent allowed by the monitoring activity, a synthetic view of MEDA partners regarding their technical, financial and institutional capacity to support the proper implementation of project activities, maintain an adequate level of efficiency and effectiveness, promote the overall project effect over the targeted areas and undertake the appropriate actions to secure its long-term viability. It should be noted, without neglecting the importance of the National factor, that the key aspect affecting overall project performance is the capacity, experience and motivation of partner institutions, rather than their origin and/or the general political environment. More specifically:

### Israel

Because of its high National income, Israel is not eligible for bilateral funding under MEDA. It has however been involved in a wide variety of Euro–Mediterranean regional programmes funded under the MEDA Programme. As a rule, the country is cautiously participating in a small number of projects, where MEDA partners such as Turkey, Malta, Cyprus and Maghreb countries are involved. To date, in the frame of the SMAP Programmes, Israel is only involved in the project “Water Community programme to promote community based awareness” that is already successfully completed. Judging from this project and other regional programmes, Israel’s involvement has been professional and characterised by commitment, good organisation, adequate technical skills and very good samples of work.

### Jordan

In general, Jordan is strongly committed to the reinforcement of its cooperation with the EU towards common objectives and is the best performer in relation to the MEDA Programme. It appears as a very well organised partner in the MEDA Programme as regards the availability of experts and knowledge of the local scene. The participation of quite active Jordanian NGOs and of universities is very promising and their commitment to contribute to the projects with highly qualified experts is proven. Some more flexibility must be shown from the side of the State entities in order to promote and facilitate the implementation of such projects, especially in cases where relevant public sector institutions are also involved. In general, the success seems due to Jordan’s advanced position in the

implementation of the Association Agreement, to its absorption capacity and its commitment to the Barcelona Process. It is however important to note that the regional instability often neutralises the results of Jordan's effects.

### **Lebanon**

In view of the country's economic and political situation, projects and programmes under MEDA focus mainly on economic transition and reform, rehabilitation of public institutions, industrial modernisation and balanced social development. Nevertheless, the country is adequately present also in regional initiatives such as the SMAP Programme. At the moment, Lebanon participates in four SMAP projects. Lebanon is modestly participating in the projects without causing major problems, risks or delays to the projects' work. There are no remarkable successes identified in this respect, and (with the exception of the "Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia"), there are no serious problems related to the execution of SMAP projects in Lebanon or to the contribution of the Lebanese partners. As in the cases of other Programmes, in view of the in-country balance among ethnic/political parties, Lebanese SMAP partners have had some organisational problems, mainly related to cases where institutional structures were required.

### **Palestinian Authority**

In spite of the situation prevailing for some years now, Palestine is participating in the MEDA Programme with an intense interest and remarkable commitment to the projects. Although no major events have been taking place in the territories, Palestine representatives prove very active and efficient with respect to carrying out their foreseen tasks.

### **Syria**

Syria was late in accepting the terms of co-operation under the MEDA regulation and only signed a Framework Agreement in 2000. Since then, economic cooperation has taken place within the MEDA framework and reform-oriented projects have been launched, focusing on economic and administrative reform in both the private and public sector. Syria is gradually improving absorption of funds in MEDA cooperation and in most cases manages to prove its capacity as a MEDA Partner. In general Syrian partners have maintained an adequate level of participation in the SMAP projects and demonstrate an average performance, with the already mentioned exception of the project "Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia".

### **Tunisia**

Tunisia constitutes a valuable partner, participating in four SMAP II projects and hosting two Project Coordinators. The country –like the other two Maghreb countries– faces specific problems in securing its smooth participation in the projects, mainly due to a number of administrative difficulties, organisational and technical problems. In general Tunisian partners appear committed and devoted to their projects, managing to sustain an adequate level of quality. The limited Internet access in this country remains a serious problem.

The following Table 11 summarises the picture of SMAP projects in the various beneficiary countries, as illustrated through the monitoring activity.

Table 10: Situation of projects in the various MED countries

Country	P1: Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness	P2: Integrated waste management for the olive oil industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	P3: Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	P4: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia	P5: M&E of action programme for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries	P6: Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreg & Maghreb countries	P7: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia	P8: Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans	P9: Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMS)	P10: Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands	P11: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification programme in the MED countries	P12: The Fara'a & Jerash Integrated Water Management Project
Jordan	😊	😊										

Syria			😊	😞								
Tunisia					😊	😊						
Lebanon							😞					
Spain								😊			😊	
Italy									😊	😊		
Palestine												😊

Key: 😊 Good, 😊 Room for improvement, 😞 Problems

#### 4.6 Analysis per type of partner

SMAP I and SMAP II Programmes have already attracted a large number of multi-disciplinary partners, with a wide range of technical, administrative, financial and scientific capacities. Partners are mainly falling under the following generic categories:

- National Authorities
- Public Sector Institutions
- Universities
- NGOs
- Private Sector entities
- International Organisations

Depending on the scientific, technical and business project context, the involvement, motivation and effectiveness of each partner type may vary significantly, also depending on the capacity of each individual partner institution. The type of partners for the monitored SMAP projects is presented below in Table 12.

Table 11: Type of Partners of SMAP Projects

Type of partner \ Project	Water Community Programme	Integrated Coastal Management	PV water pumping & purification programme	M&E action programme for combating desertification	Urban air quality improvement	RMSU	Regional solid waste management project in METAP	Demonstration project on strategies to combat desertification	Fara'a & Jerash integrated watershed management	Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries
National Authorities		✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
NGOs	✓								✓	✓
Universities			✓					✓	✓	
Public Sector Institutions			✓	✓	✓					
Private Sector Entities		✓				✓	✓			
International Organisations (UNDP, Others)	✓	✓		✓			✓			✓

Arab Maghreb Union/ METAP/MEDCITIES				✓	✓		✓			
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--

An analysis is provided below of the performance and attitude of each partner type group, as observed through the monitoring of the implementation of the SMAP Projects.

### **National Authorities**

The National Authorities constitute the driving force behind the SMAP Programme in the Region, as illustrated in Table 12. Ministries, Agencies/Centres and Municipal Services are the main National representatives involved in the Programme. In almost all cases the Ministry of Environment and/or Agriculture is the higher-level representative of each partner country. Their presence and support is always essential, especially for facilitating procedures that could otherwise consume a large amount of time and effort to implement. In most of the cases National Authorities rather undertake administrative & organisational roles, by assigning the appropriate human resources and securing that all local resources are made available to the projects. In general they have advanced IT infrastructure, skilful personnel and administrative efficiency, especially compared to other Public Sector Institutions, but not enough motivation and interest.

### **Universities**

Universities prove to be most valuable partners for projects of technical content such as the SMAP projects (e.g. PV water pumping & purification, Demonstration project on strategies to combat desertification). Their capacity is usually high and the skills of their staff are very advanced. In most cases they possess significant knowledge critical to the projects. Universities possess the required resources and are efficient, effective, knowledgeable and motivated. In general they are well familiar with EC procedures and have the administrative capacity to carry out project tasks. On the other hand, due to their strong academic focus, universities are not really able to provide the projects with adequate practical expertise and address real life problems. In several cases the approaches followed by university partners are somehow theoretical, away from the situation in the field.

### **Public Sector Institutions**

Public sector institutions include state controlled bodies like the National Agency for Environment Protection (Tunisia), the Regional Activity Centre for cleaner production (RAC/Spain), the TICHKA Association (Morocco), the Centre for the Development of Renewable Energies (CDER/Algeria), the ANME in Tunisia, the Environmental Quality Authority in Palestine and other bodies directly or indirectly involved in the water management and waste management. These institutions have sometimes demonstrated considerable commitment and efficiency in their participation in the projects. Their staff is usually experienced, open to cooperation and willing to benefit from their participation to the projects. These organisations are in general efficient, effective and well performing in project consortia.

### **NGOs**

As in the case of other Regional Programmes like the Cultural Heritage II and III and the Euromed Water, the involvement of NGOs in projects has rather controversial effects. In many cases NGOs, based on their experience and strong networking in the region, provide and secure the necessary level of co-operation and visibility of project efforts in the beneficiary area. NGOs are ideal for motivating local stakeholders, promoting the projects and effectively dealing with local communities. A potential risk in NGOs participation is the limited administrative capacity and means, the lack of experience in project management and the emotional approach to existing needs. It is therefore essential that NGOs efforts be combined with the knowledge and managerial experience of other types of partners.

### **Private Sector entities**

Independent firms and consulting companies are usually able to conceive, design and execute projects of original concept and good quality, and possess the required resources and experience to



carry out all steps included in the typical PCM approach. In most cases of SMAP projects, they have the required administrative capacity and experience to smoothly run EC funded projects without major deficiencies, but they usually put the overall usefulness and sustainability of efforts at second priority, focusing on short-term benefits, usually acquired within the projects' life cycle. This necessitates the participation of public institutions and stakeholders, as a balancing factor, both during the project design and implementation phases.

### **International Organisations**

International Organisations such as the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) in Tunisia, the Arab Maghreb Union in Morocco, MEDCITIES, the World Bank and the United Nations global development network (UNDP) are directly or indirectly involved in the combat against desertification and regional environmental management. By their mandate and scope, these organisations are valuable partners in SMAP projects, they can mobilise any relevant expertise required and can undertake any of the roles, including coordination, stabilisation of the partners' team and management. Nevertheless, in some cases problems have occurred, due to their framework of procedures and reporting templates, which is different than the EC one.

## 5. SPECIAL ISSUES

---

### 5.1. Deconcentration

Deconcentration aims at ensuring direct contact between the EC management of projects and the projects themselves in the region. Following the deconcentration process, the SMAP II Programme has been recently assigned to the EC Delegation in Egypt. The Task Manager has recently taken over the project files and is in the course of being briefed. As mentioned in section 3.3.2, one of the Leading Monitors of the SMAP Programme has debriefed the Task Manager on the overall findings and conclusions of the Monitoring Team on the progress and performance of the SMAP projects in 2005.

The SMAP Programme has, by design, some specific features; it consists of projects that are widely distributed in the MEDA region, address a limited number of countries each and are managed by Coordinators based in MED countries, as opposite to the majority of MEDA Regional Programmes. In the opinion of the Monitors, this set-up calls for regular visits of the Egypt-based Task Manager to the other MED countries, for the purpose of visiting the Coordinators and the local components of the Programme's projects and consulting with the EC Delegations on the involved "horizontal" (but also country-specific) issues.

Furthermore, as revealed through the monitoring activity in 2005, there seems to be no concrete procedure for the cooperation of the EC Delegations with the EC Delegation that is responsible for each of the big Regional Programmes, in the direction of (a) coordination and follow-up of the projects in the country of their responsibility and (b) provision of assistance to the responsible Task Manager on issues related to the country of their responsibility. In view of the specificities of the SMAP Programme, these are important parameters for ensuring close and efficient follow-up and management of the projects and thus of the Programme.

### 5.2. Follow up on recommendations

Recommendations to project partners are included in the Monitoring Reports, but also directly communicated, in more detail, during the Monitoring Missions. Monitors' comments cover the five performance criteria for each project, but also aim towards specific emerging project issues. The majority of recommendations addressed to the project Coordinators and Partners, falls into the following categories:

- Comments on project design (LFM / Organisation / Structure);
- Comments concerning general implementation issues, efficiency, effectiveness, impact (quality of deliverables / outcome, partner's input, delays, etc.);
- Comments on the sustainability prospects;
- Comments on ad-hoc issues (funding problems / replacement of partners / administrative difficulties / equipment procurement / preparation of riders, etc.).

As most of the recommendations are aimed towards critical project issues, their majority is being adopted either directly or indirectly, as a result of a relevant notice of the Task Manager. In most cases the comment given by the monitors reveals or confirms project issues that may create risks in the near future. In critical cases, recommendations are rapidly filtered by respective EC services and reach the project coordinator in order to take the required actions. Indicative examples of the receipt and exploitation of recommendations made by the Monitors on SMAP projects are provided below:

#### **Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agropastoral Communities in North Africa**

Project design slightly re-adjusted after the extension of the project and procurement issues treated with top priority, as recommended by the monitor.

#### **Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries**

The Coordinator has taken into consideration the Monitors' comments and recommendations and has acted rather successfully in overcoming the time lost, while also worked for ensuring the partners' contribution to the promotion and sustainability of the project's results.

#### **Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia**

It seems that the Coordinator did not take the comments and recommendations of the previous monitoring under consideration; no major corrective actions have been undertaken in order to improve project performance.

#### **Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan**

The project was monitored for first time in 2005, during its mobilisation phase in Jordan and Syria. The recommendation to the regional project coordinator to elaborate a detailed work plan for the first year was fully adopted by the EC Delegation in Syria, who confirmed that there would be a request to the Coordinator to submit a work plan.

#### **Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)**

The recommendations of the previous monitoring report have been moderately considered; indicatively: upgrading of the SMAP Correspondents network and consider project redesign as time extension in the pending contract amendment.

#### **M&E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries**

The project design has been significantly improved as a result of relevant recommendations of the Monitors for the elaboration of a correct Logical Framework Matrix (LFM).

#### **The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project**

The inception report was revised in line with EC comments. Environmental Quality Authority (EQA) speeded up the implementation of project activities.

#### **Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality**

Two of the recommendations have been adopted by the project (extension of the project by 1 year, adjustment of the planning and allocation of tasks to partners). However, despite the Monitors' recommendation, the Coordinator did not adjust the project purpose towards more modest levels. Elaboration of the logframe is still pending. The correlation between objectives, results and activities is still confusing and the assumptions in the intervention logic are still absent.

#### **Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness**

The Co-ordinator discussed with the Monitor on ways to improve the design and construction of rainwater harvesting installations in existing buildings.

### **5.3. Logical Framework Approach**

The SMAP Programmes are within the context of the problems prevailing in the Environment Sector of the Mediterranean countries, and the priorities addressed by the projects are appropriate and interesting, covering a large thematic area from water management to solid waste management, to coastal management, to combating desertification and to urban air quality. Most of the projects have been originally conceived during -or before- 2001, when most of the future contractors were apparently not well familiar with the PCM methodology. Setting up a project of such a size, scope and objectives could be a hard and demanding work, especially for those organisations with no prior experience on the PCM principles.

Out of 10 projects, 7 have adequately developed Logical Framework Matrices and therefore concise, structured and well presented design. The Project Purpose (PP) and the Overall Objectives (OO) are in most cases well defined and address actual needs. However, there are problems such as unclear activities' breakdown and vague Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), not easily measurable in practice. A project with a good LFM is the "Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification programme in the MED countries"; this LFM is a very appropriate tool for organising the project's work and the monitoring of the project's implementation.

It is however noted that, as reported also in the Synthesis Reports on the Euromed Heritage and Water Programmes, in general the LFM has not yet acquired its supposed instrumental role for planning and especially for managing projects. Even in the case of SMAP, where Logframes are adequate to good, they are not used as a project management tool, at least at the expected extent.

## **6. SUCCESS STORY**

---

As reported in section 4.1, a number of projects have received, in 2005, only “a” and “b” scores; they can thus be considered as successes. Among them, the project “Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries” could be an example of good practice.

### **6.1. Background**

The project is part of the SMAP II Programme, and was designed in line with the Barcelona Process in the area of Integrated Water Management. Its design is very professional and is reflected in a Logframe of very good quality. The project represents an original and innovative approach for dealing with the shortage of potable water and lack of electricity in rural areas in the Mediterranean basin.

### **6.2. Reasons of success**

The main reasons of the project’s success are as follows:

- A small number (3) of beneficiary partner countries are involved / addressed.
- The project partners and other relevant actors had been involved in the project’s design.
- The project implementation is well planned and programmed and this provides the basis for achievement of the foreseen results.
- The management of the project is very efficient; the project inputs and activities are monitored to ensure that they are on time and at planned cost; there are no deviations from the original plan, and the results are of good quality.
- In general, adequate institutional support and support by the public sector has been provided (despite some initial problems in Algeria).
- All planned beneficiaries have access to the project results.
- National experts undertake most of the project’s implementation, and thus the project is fully embedded in the local structures.



## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 7.1. Overall conclusions on the SMAP projects, as implemented

The SMAP Programme is a multidisciplinary initiative, bringing together various partners, holding key roles in the environment sector of the Mediterranean region. Most of its interventions are focusing on real life problems concerning environmental protection, capacity building and improvement of legislative, regulatory and institutional frameworks of the partner countries. The projects involve stakeholders of the environment and energy sector: NGOs, National Authorities, public and private entities as well as end users, for example farmers.

The projects are in general implemented in accordance with the general directions of the SMAP Programme, as mentioned in the Programme Areas of Action and Horizontal Themes. The results so far are promising and, since environment protection is a prime necessity, the active involvement of the relevant actors is quite high. Although most of the involved countries have national strategies and plans for the matter, it seems that all positive mobilisations so far have been initiated mainly through the EC funding and not so much as a result of concise national or regional policies on environmental issues. Policy guidelines and pilot / demonstration interventions will offer the basis for the development and application of a regional environment policy in the area. To achieve this, National Authorities and public sector entities should be further mobilised either through the projects or through similar initiatives. Obviously NGOs, research centres and universities, with the assistance of local environmental authorities and individuals, can demonstrate through the projects that solutions exist and are feasible. For example through the project “*Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries*”, an innovative and state-of-the-art technology was introduced in the targeted areas and could be replicated in other areas in the Mediterranean basin.

The overall picture of the SMAP I and SMAP II Programmes at the level of analysis allowed by the monitoring work seems fairly good, although projects which include construction or works for the implementation of pilot plants have not yet initiated these activities or suffer from delays in this respect. Most of the projects are running their final phase and it is up to the projects' Coordinators and partners to ensure that delays will be overcome, activities implementation will carry on according to workplan and on time and that the development of the pilot interventions, whenever foreseen, will be managed in a timely and disciplined way. Projects' results, delivered so far, are of good quality and seem right on course for achieving a satisfactory level of success. Moreover the preparation of phase out strategies and developing plans for maintaining and disseminating project benefits long after project end, is considered a priority for ensuring sustainability. Only then will the projects be able to guarantee that the funds allocated for their implementation were well invested and at this stage this remains to be seen.

A summary of key issues identified by the Monitors is presented below:

#### ■ Project Design

Out of 10 projects, 7 have adequately developed Logical Framework Matrices and concise, structured and well presented design. The original design of these projects, although sometimes ambitious, is consistent with the regional plans of the targeted countries. The project purpose and the overall objectives are in most cases in full alignment with National policies, address actual needs and achievable. In some cases adjustment to the original design was necessary in order to meet emerging priorities, expand the planned project components, add new components and cope with changes of market prices of the procured equipment or the selected region.

#### ■ Project Duration

All the SMAP projects except the project “*Integrated management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan*”, have received extensions in order to face delays related to administrative procedures. The extension varies from 7 months to 3 years. An issue that was not well anticipated and planned by the projects' coordinators is the duration of the tendering process (for equipment procurement and/or for services such as training etc.).

#### ■ Sustainability Prospects

Sustainability is the strongest criterion for the SMAP Programme. In most of the cases, Project Partners have expressed their willingness to actively support projects' results, but allocating national funds and adapting relevant policies and legislation could further promote project results. In most cases SMAP projects are totally supported on the National level and their priorities coincide with national and regional priorities. At local level, in projects where construction of pilot interventions included, there is official commitment for each pilot intervention and maintenance plans as well as dissemination activities are under discussion with the local partners. However, in some cases there is unequal willingness of the state actors of involved countries to actively support results. For example, in the project "*Urban air quality improvement*", the laboratory in Larnaca (Cyprus) has been already integrated in the structure of municipality, while in Tetouan (Morocco) the local partner has difficulties to sustain the project results without additional funding and without the support of the local authorities. Finally, the projects have not presented so far (nor are they planning to do so) a concrete phase out strategy and a plan (feasibility study or business plan) for making operations viable long after the project completion.

## 7.2. Lessons Learnt

The experience gained through the monitoring of the SMAP Programme in 2005 has shown the following:

- Proper design. Partners should fully respect the principles of PCM/LFA. A careful consideration of requirements, risks and costs should be made before going on with a project. Project description should be short and clear and supported by project management tools.
- Efficient management. Experience of project coordinators, both in the Environment sector and in Management of big international projects, as well as a record of previous cooperation among the partners are invaluable assets for efficiency and effectiveness. A common difficulty that every project faces in the beginning is that each partner has its own view about the project and concentrates in its individual activities. A special project strategy should be developed to combine the different views and opinions into a common vision towards the achievement of the project purpose.
- Ensured sustainability. Sustainability is one of the priority issues to be considered, even at project design stage. Issues regarding sustainability of the project results and better ways on how to disseminate the results should be discussed among the Partners long before the project ends and phase-out strategies should be elaborated.
- Administrative Issues. Many projects have suffered serious problems, related to unforeseen administrative difficulties sourcing from the need to apply EC rules & regulations. The coordinators should give clear instructions to all involved partners at an early stage, before it is too late for the project. The RMSU seems to have helped in this direction.

## 7.3. Recommendations

Following the above analysis, the following recommendations are presented for the consideration of the relevant EC Services:

1. Projects should be asked to submit a precise Project Description. The text should be simple, short and clear, and should be complemented by a proper LFM, a complete and detailed work break down, a complete list of deliverables, and a network diagram illustrating the relations between tasks and respective deadlines.
2. Inception Workshops organised by the Projects' Coordinators with the participation of all core parties and key partners would be very useful: all issues such as inception report, technical approach and managerial issues would be analysed and discussed so that possible misunderstandings can be avoided.
3. Further guidance should be given to the projects in order to improve the quality of reporting. In their technical reports, progress should be clearly specified and assessed against the detailed plan of activities that has been prepared by the project. Furthermore, proper guidelines should be prepared (probably by the RMSU), covering key project issues, especially the ones hiding administrative difficulties, as indicated above.

4. National decision makers are easily reached in English and French, but often they have difficulties in the translation of concepts in their language in order to bring them to the final users (local authorities and communities). Arabic language is a strategic tool to bring the messages to local authorities and to local communities. At least the projects' technical reports should be translated in Arabic.
5. More and more close coordination among the SMAP projects is needed, in to exchange experiences, secure complementarity and avoid overlapping or duplication of effort.
6. Sustainability should be a concern of the project design as well as of its implementation. Phase-out strategies and dissemination strategies could be an integral part of the project's scope and this could be part of the requirements of the Terms of Reference.
7. Project Coordinators as well as project partners should always receive an abstract of any monitoring / evaluation mission's comments and recommendations addressed to them. This way they will be given the opportunity to respond to these comments as well as to take appropriate corrective actions whenever necessary.
8. In similar cases in the future, where a lot of projects are contracted under a big programme, the RMSU should be the first project launched in order to apply common standards to all projects (e.g. management reporting, check for overlapping activities etc.)



## **ANNEX I**

---

**Monitoring Reports produced in 2005**

## Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Project Data						Monitoring Data			Conclusions					Action Points
	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	
1	54734	SMAP I: Water Community Programme to promote community based awareness	JORDAN	561.063	22/08/05	ECOPEACE-FOEME	6	10065.05	Sakis Galigalis/Jamal Jaber	b	b	b	a	a	General: An interesting project, doing valuable grass root work with only modest EC resources. The Coordinator should: 1) Develop capacities in Project Cycle Management; 2) Consider integrating renewable energy in the eco-park design; 3) Promote integration of Water Wise Building features, right from the design of new buildings; 4) When water tanks are mounted on building tops, consider building stability against earthquakes; 5) Coordinate with the IRWA Project.
2	75816	SMAP II: Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan	JORDAN	1.738.411	28/02/08	UNDP - Lebanon	6	10264.01	Kyriakos Argyroudis	b	b	b	b	b	1) Pilot project: The request from the Jordanian MoE, to have a pilot project for the treatment of olive oil industry effluents (liquid and solid), instead of a pilot project where the main objective is to demonstrate to the national olive oil pressing owners the actual processing procedures using cleaner production techniques should be positively received by the EC, and this will also prove the Project capacity to adjust and improve its design and effectiveness (the monitor's arguments in favour of this change are outlined above). 2) The EC Delegations of the three countries should be included as observer members in the National Steering Committees. 3) The Regional Project Coordinator should elaborate detailed activity plans, one per country, for the first year.
3	75816	SMAP II: Integrated waste management for the olive-oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan	SYRIA	1.738.411	28/02/08	UNDP - Lebanon	8	10264.02	Kyriakos Argyroudis	b	b	b	b	b	1. Associations of the oil pressing mills owners/operators should be included as members to the National Steering Committee. 2. The Regional Project Coordinator should elaborate a detailed National Activity Plan, for the first year of the project implementation.
4	54736	SMAP I: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbell/Amsheet and Latakia	SYRIA	1.401.100	04/11/05	ENVIROTECH	8	10043.04	Sakis Galigalis	c	d	d	d	d	General: 1) A project, designed to respond to a well identified need. 2) Unfortunately, a MEDA failure story for Syria. Task Manager: It makes sense, to stick to the decision to close the project by 04.11.05 Ministry / Task Manager, Brussels / MEDA-RMSU / Coordinator / EU Delegation: Consider using this project failure, as case study, to draw lessons for the future.
5	61789	SMAP II: M&E of action programmes for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries	TUNISIA	1.438.945	31/12/05	Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel (OSS)	9	10174.02	Nikos Kessissoglou	b	c	b	b	a	O.S.S: 1) Submit the soonest possible a request for a second time extension to be financed by the non utilised budget at the end of 2005; 2) Aim at a realistic balance among scientific/technical development, participating practices and achievement of practical results within the existing time and budget constraints; 3) Elaborate urgently the Guide for the application of the SME by the institutional stakeholders; 4) Enhance further the involvement of the Project Partner IRA (Institut des Regions Arides); 5) Enhance further the direct involvement of NGOs; 6) Continue to devote adequate attention to the three project beneficiaries (Tunisia, Morocco, UMA); 7) Persist in avoiding demands outside the scope of the approved logical framework. Country Authorities in Tunisia and Morocco: Make sure that there will be in time a proper counterpart structure to take over the SME from the Project after its end. DG E+QL/MoESD: Launch a public awareness campaign on the PAN and the SME, for which there is provision in the Ministry budget.
6	61785	SMAP II: Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreq & Maghreb countries	TUNISIA	5.000.000	31/12/06	Agence Nationale pour l'Environnement (ANPE)	9	10173.02	Nikos Kessissoglou	a	b	a	b	a	METAP Secretariat/WB: 1) Expedite the replacement of the Regional Coordinator; 2) Finalise the new contract with the TA (IC); 3) Reconsider the Grant to ANPE. WB/ RMG: 1) Intensify the efforts for the finalisation and validation of the on-going studies; 2) Evaluate the project results to date in the 8 partner countries, especially the legal and institutional developments and come up with a strategy and national plans for overcoming the existing barriers and enhancing project impact during project life; 3) Develop early the cluster of experts in each country and promote the idea of establishing a Regional Centre of Excellence in one of the 8 partner countries. ANPE/ANGED: 1) Create the soonest possible the Centre in order to give it the opportunity of a continuing project input until the end 2006; 2) Provide the Centre with adequate financial means and maximum independence. EU/WB: Consider a follow up project in order to enhance and consolidate the legal and institutional results and boost national capacity building and investments.

## Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Project Data						Monitoring Data			Conclusions					Action Points
	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	
7	54736	SMAP I: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet and Latakia	LEBANON	1.401.100	04/11/05	ENVIROTECH	10	10043.05	John Durant	d	d	c	d	c	Lessons learned from this project are clear: - without proper management oversight the project has "drifted", and has not delivered the outputs foreseen in the original design. The contractor has not allocated sufficient staff, time and resources for proper implementation; has failed to engage the institutions with which the project was supposed partner; and failed to deliver any significant long-term benefits. Even considering the political situation between the two countries, all parties/stakeholders involved in this project – the contractor, the central and local government authorities in both countries and the EC - have failed to be involved and responsible for the professional delivery of project deliverables. The issue of how a contractor can "drop" certain interventions without clear discussions with all parties, needs to be addressed. So that lessons can be learned, so that future designs can be tailored, with the participation of the end-beneficiaries to meet real and agreed needs, and, oversight management is in-place, it is recommended that there is a full and detailed project evaluation conducted without delay in the very near future.
8	61787	SMAP II: Urban air quality improvement through Air Quality and Mobility Plans and the institutional strengthens of local administration on air quality	SPAIN	2.020.745	31/03/06	Institut Catala d'Energia (ICAEN)	11	10177.02	Konstantinos Missirlis	c	c	b	b	b	Lessons learnt: 1) Several delays in the beginning of the project caused it to become primarily activities-oriented, losing the focus on the PRs and partially on the PP. 2) Poor reporting with only 3 management reports in 4 years, with a content not fully compliant with the General Conditions \$2(2) and Technical Annex \$2.5, as well as lack of a logframe are not helping for a close monitoring of the project. In view of the imminent end of the project it is recommended: ICAEN: 1) Update the public part of the web-site. 2) Consider a MPL also for El-Fayhaa where the transportation sector has been identified as the main source of air pollution. Tetouan: 1) Solve payment flow issue by opening a new bank account independent from the financial administration of the Municipality. 2) Install the flow regulator for the GC.
9	61792	SMAP II: Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMS)	ITALY	3.124.000	30/06/06	Agenzia per la Protezione dell' Ambiente e per i Servizi Tecnici (APAT)	11	10179.02	Sakis Galigalis	a	a	b	b	b	General: A different well-designed and useful project is coming close to end. EC/Contractor: 1) It makes sense to consider an one-year extension (continuity of the whole SMAP programme); 2) In drafting the extension proposal, plan for resources to reach politicians; 3) If the information "Clearing House" is likely to continue, reconsider its current title.
10	61790	SMAP II: Demonstration Project on Strategies to Combat Desertification in Arid Lands with Direct Involvement of Local Agropastoral Communities in North Africa	ITALY	3.446.678	01/04/07	Nucleo di Ricerca sulla Desertificazione dell'Universita di Sassari, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Animal Sciences.	11	10192.02	Sakis Galigalis	b	b	b	b	b	General: A well-designed project, the only SMAP project in the actual field of fight against desertification, deserving support from all quarters. Project Coordinator: Develop plans to avoid losing plantation seasons from miss-performing contractors. EC Task Manager: Allow the Project to meet the Tunisian farmers' request to build a new water well (no extra budget).
11	61788	SMAP II: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries	SPAIN	2.291.013	21/12/05	Universidad Politecnica de Madrid – Instituto de Energia Solar (IDES)	11	10178.02	Panagiotis Leventis	b	a	a	a	b	PC: Keep up good work. Finalise operation and maintenance agreements before project end. Partners: Ensure their contribution to the promotion and sustainability of the project's results.

## Monitoring Reports Produced in 2005

C/N	Project Data						Monitoring Data			Conclusions					Action Points
	Ref. No	Title	Country	Primary Commitment	End Date	Project Authority	Mission No.	Report Ref.	Monitor	Design	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Impact	Sustainability	
12	61794	SMAP II: The Fara'a and Jerash Integrated Watershed Management Project	OCCUPIED TERRITORIES PALESTINE	3.881.730	30/09/07	Environmental Quality Authority (EQA), Palestinian National Authority	13	10182.02	Kyriakos Argyroudis/Aris Tsalmans	b	b	b	b	b	EC-DEL: 1) Pilot project in Jerash: it is recommended that the EC Delegation in Cairo in close cooperation with the management teams of the two SMAP projects clarify this issue in order to avoid possible duplication. Project Management: 1) Comply better with the EC requirements and speed up the whole process of payment, to avoid problem of slow absorption of the remaining budget, 2) Establish a mechanism in order to secure good communication between the partners, 3) Initiate discussions on sustainability issues with local communities, 4) Speed up process for contract finalisation and try to make up for the lost project time.

## ANNEX II

### Average score per criterion per project across the years

Project	Year	Number of Visits	Criterion					AVERAGE
			Quality of project design	Efficiency to date	Effectiveness to date	Impact Prospects	Sustainability	
SMAP I: Water Community Programme to Promote community based awareness	2002	2	2,88	3,85	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,15
	2003	2	3,00	3,35	3,55	3,00	3,00	3,18
	2005	1	3,00	3,40	3,10	3,55	3,11	3,23
	Average	-	2,96	3,53	3,22	3,18	3,04	3,19
SMAP I: Integrated waste management for the olive oil pressing industries in Lebanon, Syria & Jordan	2002							
	2003							
	2005	2	3,00	3,40	3,10	3,37	3,11	3,20
	Average	-	3,00	3,40	3,10	3,37	3,11	3,20
SMAP I: Integrated Coastal Management between Jbeil/Amsheet & Latakia	2002	2	2,63	2,25	2,70	3,00	3,00	2,72
	2003	1	2,00	2,00	2,10	2,00	3,00	2,22
	2005	2	1,50	1,00	1,60	1,00	1,70	1,36
	Average	-	2,04	1,75	2,13	2,00	2,57	2,10
SMAP II: M&E of action programme for combating desertification in the Maghreb countries	2002							
	2003	1	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
	2005	1	3,30	2,40	2,80	3,50	3,63	3,13
	Average	-	3,15	2,70	2,90	3,25	3,31	3,06
SMAP II: Regional solid waste management project in METAP Mashreb & Maghreb countries	2002							
	2003	1	3,75	2,80	3,00	4,00	4,00	3,51
	2005	1	4,00	3,20	3,60	3,00	3,75	3,51
	Average	-	3,88	3,00	3,30	3,50	3,88	3,51
SMAP II: Urban air quality improvement through air quality and mobility plans	2002							
	2003	1	2,25	1,00	2,10	2,00	3,00	2,07
	2005	1	2,00	2,20	2,60	3,00	3,44	2,65
	Average	-	2,13	1,60	2,35	2,50	3,22	2,36
SMAP II: Management of horizontal activities and support to the regional Euro Mediterranean Programme for the Environment (RMSU)	2002							
	2003	1	2,50	2,30	2,40	3,00	3,00	2,64
	2005	1	4,00	3,80	3,00	3,00	3,11	3,38
	Average	-	3,25	3,05	2,70	3,00	3,06	3,01
SMAP II: Demonstration project on strategies to combat desertification in arid lands with direct involvement of local agropastoral communities in North	2002							
	2003	1	2,50	2,30	2,40	2,00	3,00	2,44
	2005	1	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,30	3,06
	Average	-	2,75	2,65	2,70	2,50	3,15	2,75
SMAP II: Implementation of a PV water pumping and purification program in the MED countries	2002							
	2003	1	2,75	3,00	3,80	3,00	3,00	3,11
	2005	1	3,00	3,60	3,60	3,55	3,50	3,45
	Average	-	2,88	3,30	3,70	3,28	3,25	3,28
SMAP II: The Fara'a & Jerash Integrated watershed Management Project	2002		2,66	2,25	2,66	3,00	3,00	2,71
	2003	1	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,96
	2005	1	3,00	2,80	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,98
	Average	-	2,89	2,68	2,89	3,00	3,00	2,89
ALL	2002	4	2,72	2,78	2,79	3,00	3,00	2,86
	2003	9	2,75	2,53	2,82	2,78	3,11	2,79
	2005	12	2,98	2,88	2,94	3,00	3,17	2,99
	Average	-	2,82	2,73	2,85	2,92	3,09	2,88